

## REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 14, 17, 18, 31 and 34 are independent. Claims 1, 14, 17, 18, 31, and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the final action mailed May 10, 2006 is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-34 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,987,256 ("Wu").

In response to the applicant's arguments filed on February 21, 2006, the examiner stated with respect to independent claims 1 and 18:

Third: Regarding Applicants' argument that Wu does not teach "generating a plurality of views of the document for display in a display environment, two or more of the views being based on different color palettes, the plurality of views including a document view and an object view, ... each color containing object in the document view being represented using the document color palette, and ... the one color containing object in the object view being represented using an object color palette associated with the object view."

See, Wu, figure 10, and see, col. 16, lines 36-37, teaching that the views of a document for display in a display environment are determined by the color palette function, which is used for every page. Therefore, a new color palette appropriate to each page in any of a variety of different devices with displays is taught by Wu. (pages 12 and 13 of the final action)

The examiner also stated with respect to independent claims 14, 17, 31, and 34:

Second: Regarding Applicants' argument that Wu fails to teach the following limitations: "multiple views for each of a plurality of graphics objects of the electronic document, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a display environment." See Wu, col. 19, lines 16-67, specifically lines 22-23, teaching an alternative server and display environment wherein "the server acts as a source of precompiled data sets for thin client platforms." The precompiled data sets for thin client platforms are the different color palettes for rendering in a display environments. See also, Wu, col. 19, lines 30-33, teaching that the server is used for the computing tasks to connect to the various thin display devices. Each of the thin display devices displays a view based on its particular color palette, as saved by the server.

Third: Regarding Applicants' argument that Wu fails to teach "a first view for each graphics object based on a color palette for the graphics object and a

second view for each graphics object based on a document color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document." See, Wu, col. 2, lines 42-54, teaching a color palette for the source document as the "color palette for the graphics object" and a color palette for the target document as the "color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document." (pages 14 and 15 of the final action)

Taken together, the applicant understands the examiner's position to be as follows: (1) a color palette for a document according to a profile of a source device corresponds to an "object color palette;" (2) a view generated by rendering a document using the color palette that is based on a profile of a source device corresponds to an "object view;" (3) a color palette for a document according to a profile of a target device corresponds to a "document color palette;" (4) a view generated by rendering a document using the color palette that is based on a profile of a target device corresponds to a "document view;" and (5) each target device has its own document color palette, i.e., three target devices, three document color palettes.

With respect to item (2) above, the applicant notes that the view generated by rendering a document using the color palette that is based on a profile of a source device is to be displayed in a display environment of the source device. With respect to item (4) above, the applicant notes that the view generated by rendering a document using the color palette that is based on a profile of a target device is to be displayed in a display environment of the target device. That is, the "object view" and the "document view" (as those terms are understood based on the examiner's position) are to be displayed in different display environments: one of a source device and one of a target device. There is no teaching or suggestion in Wu of the "object view" and the "document view" being generated for display in a single display environment. Even if the "document view" is interpreted to encompass views corresponding to each page of a translated document (i.e., a document that has been translated for use on a target device), the display of each and every one of those views is based on the document color palette of the target device. There is no teaching or suggestion in Wu of using different color palettes to render the views of the pages of the translated document for display in a display environment of the target device.

The applicant submits that no portion of Wu, cited by the examiner or otherwise, discloses or suggests "generating a plurality of views of the document for display in a single display environment, ... the plurality of views including a document view and an object view, ...

wherein a display of the document view in the display environment involves rendering the color containing objects in the document view using the document color palette, and wherein a display of the object view in the display environment involves rendering the one color containing object in the object view using an object color palette associated with the object view," as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependents are allowable over Wu.

The foregoing remarks also apply to independent claim 18, which have corresponding limitations, and the claims that depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 18.

The applicant further submits that no portion of Wu, cited by the examiner or otherwise, discloses or suggests "receiving an electronic document including multiple views for each of a plurality of graphics objects of the electronic document, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a single display environment, ..." as recited in amended claim 14.

For at least these reasons, claim 14 and its dependents are allowable over Wu.

The foregoing remarks also apply to independent claims 17, 31 and 34, which have similar limitations, and the claims that depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 17, 31 and 34.

### Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular position taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Atul K. Puri et al.  
Serial No. : 10/619,740  
Filed : July 14, 2003  
Page : 13 of 13


Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-594001 / P547

Date: 7/7/06

Customer Number: 21876  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21368746.doc

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mandy Jubang  
Reg. No. 45,884